REMARKS

Claims 20-36 are pending.

Claims 20-23, 26, 28-32, and 34-36 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by Morris (US 5,369,042).

Changes in the Claims:

Claim 20 has been amended in this application to further particularly point out and distinctly claim subject matter regarded as the invention. No new matter has been added.

Support for the amendment to claim 20 may be found at FIG. 5.

Rejection under 35 USC §102(b) – claims 20-23, 26, 28-32, and 34-36

Claims 20-23, 26, 28-32, and 34-36 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by Morris (US 5,369,042). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

A claim must be anticipated for a proper rejection under §102(a), (b), and (e). This requirement is satisfied "only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference"; see MPEP §2131 and *Verdegaal Bros. V. Union Oil*, 814 F.2d 628, 2 USPQ2d 1051 (Fed. Cir. 1984). A rejection under §102(b) may be overcome by showing that the claims are patentably distinguishable from the prior art; see MPEP §706.02(b).

Morris teaches a method for forming a bipolar transistor. The transistor taught in Morris (see Fig. 2e) includes portions of different layers of different doping N- and N+. Morris teaches a semi-insulating substrate 50 onto which a subcollector 52 and a layer 54

are grown. The doping zones N+ (52) and P+ (64) and insulator portions 118 have **different thickness**.

In contrast, the presently claimed invention claims that layer (2) and at least one zone (2) substantially have the **same thickness**. (see claim 20). Morris does not teach or suggest zones (52), (64) and portions (118) having the **same thickness**. See Fig. 2e of Morris.

The presently claimed invention is, accordingly, distinguishable over the cited reference. In the view of the foregoing, it is respectfully asserted that claim 20 is now in condition for allowance.

Rejection of claims 21-23, 26, 28-32, and 34-36

Claims 21-23, 26, 28-32, and 34-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b). These rejections are respectfully traversed for at least the reason that each of the rejected claims ultimately depend on an above-discussed base claim. The arguments set forth above regarding the base claims are equally applicable here. The base claims being allowable, the dependent claims must also be allowable.

Conclusion

For all of the above reasons, applicants submit that the amended claims are now in proper form, and that the amended claims all define patentable subject matter over the prior art. Therefore, Applicants submit that this application is now in condition for allowance.

Request for allowance

It is believed that this Amendment places the above-identified patent application into condition for allowance. Early favorable consideration of this Amendment is earnestly solicited. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, an interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,
THELEN REID & PRIEST LLP

Dated: December 23, 2003

Thierry K. Lo
Reg. No. 49,097

Thelen Reid & Priest LLP
P.O. Box 640640
San Jose, CA 95164-0640
(408) 282-1810 Direct
(408) 292-5800 Main
(408) 278-8210 Fax